

REMARKS

Claims 1-24 remain pending in the current application. By this Amendment, several claims are amended for clarity and to correct informalities. Support for these amendments appears to be found at least at paragraph 0033 of the original disclosure. No new matter is believed to have been added. Reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Office rejected claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 10, 14, 15, 19, 21 and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim (US 2007/0123311) in view of Jiang (US 2004/0120494). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claim 1 recites “at least one replacement sound set by the called subscriber, wherein the combination includes specific information between two of the at least one replacement sounds.” The Office conceded Kim fails to disclose specific information. The Office asserted Jiang discloses specific information combined with a replacement sound citing paragraphs 0025-0026.

The Office specifically refers to the example, “Hello, this is John. Please listen to my favorite song while my phone rings” (Jiang paragraph 0026). The Office appears to interpret this example as equivalent to specific information. The Office identifies audio and/or video information as the replacement sound citing paragraph 0025. Jiang fails to disclose “the combination includes specific information between two of the at least one replacement sounds.” The examples provided by Jiang only suggest the audio or video information occurs after the asserted specific information (Jiang paragraph 0026). Jiang fails to disclose any combination in which the replacement sounds occur prior to specific information. Thus, the disclosure of Jiang is limited to a combination in which the audio or video information comes after the specific information. One of ordinary skill in the art would not interpret Jiang as disclosing a combination in which replacement information occurs both before and after the specific information, as recited in amended claim 1.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1, as unpatentable over Kim in view of Jiang, are respectfully requested.

Amended claims 10 and 19 recite similar language to that recited in amended claim 1 and distinguish over the applied references for analogous reasons to those set forth with respect to amended claim 1.

The remaining claims depend from claims 1, 10 and 19 and distinguish over the applied references for at least the reasons set forth with respect to claims 1, 10 and 19, as well as separately distinguishing subject matter in these claims.

The Office rejected claims 2, 11, 12 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kim (US 2007/0123311) in view of Jiang (US 2004/0120494) and further in view of Wilk (US 6,768,789). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Office conceded Kim and Jiang fail to disclose text information of the personal information sound is converted into a voice by a text-to-speech engine. The Office asserted Wilk discloses the personal information sound is converted into a voice by a text-to-speech engine. The Office failed to assert Wilk discloses “at least one replacement sound set by the called subscriber, wherein the combination includes specific information between two of the at least one replacement sounds.” Wilk fails to disclose the recited claim language. Thus, Wilk fails to cure the deficiencies of Kim and Jiang.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2, 11, 12 and 20, as unpatentable of Kim in view of Jiang and further in view of Wilk, are respectfully requested.

The Office rejected claims 4, 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kim (US 2007/0123311) in view of Jiang (US 2004/0120494) and further in view of Zhu (US 2004/0203613). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Office conceded Kim and Jiang fail to disclose a voice modulation device. The Office asserted Zhu discloses a voice modulation device. The Office failed to assert Zhu discloses “at least one replacement sound set by the called subscriber, wherein the combination includes specific information between two of the at least one replacement sounds.” Zhu fails to disclose the recited claim language. Thus, Zhu fails to cure the deficiencies of Kim and Jiang.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 4, 23 and 24, as unpatentable of Kim in view of Jiang and further in view of Zhu, are respectfully requested.

The Office rejected claims 7-9 and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kim (US 2007/0123311) in view of Jiang (US 2004/0120494) and further in view of Smith (US 2002/0193125). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Office conceded Kim and Jiang fail to disclose personal information sound is different by time zone. The Office asserted Smith discloses personal information sound is different by time zone. The Office failed to assert Smith discloses “at least one replacement sound set by the called subscriber, wherein the combination includes specific information between two of the at least one replacement sounds.” Smith fails to disclose the recited claim language. Thus, Smith fails to cure the deficiencies of Kim and Jiang.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7-9 and 16-18, as unpatentable of Kim in view of Jiang and further in view of Smith, are respectfully requested.

The Office rejected claim 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Kim (US 2007/0123311) in view of Jiang (US 2004/0120494) and further in view of Wilk (US 6,768,789) and Zhu (US 2004/0203613). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Office conceded Kim, Jiang and Wilk fail to disclose a voice modulation device. The Office asserted Zhu discloses a voice modulation device. The Office failed to assert Zhu discloses “at least one replacement sound set by the called subscriber, wherein the combination includes specific information between two of the at least one replacement sounds.” Zhu fails to disclose the recited claim language. Thus, Zhu fails to cure the deficiencies of Kim, Jiang and Wilk.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 13, as unpatentable of Kim in view of Jiang and further in view of Wilk and Zhu, are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application should be in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is courteously solicited.

The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned, Applicants' attorney of record, to facilitate advancement of the present application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 07-1337 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

LOWE HAUPTMAN HAM & BERNER, LLP

/Yoon S Ham/
Yoon S. Ham
Registration No. 45,307

Customer Number: 22429
1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 300
Alexandria, Virginia 22314
(703) 684-1111
(703) 518-5499 Facsimile
Date: March 16, 2012
YSH/JLP/jr